

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **DISTRICT OF NEVADA**
10

11 CARLA JO MASTERSON,

12 Plaintiff(s),

13 v.

14 THE WALT DISNEY COMPANY, et al.,

15 Defendant(s).

Case No.: 2:18-cv-00989-JCM-NJK

ORDER

16 Pending before the Court is an order for attorney Bradley Boone to show cause why he
17 should not be subject to the requirements in Local Rule IA 11-1(b) for attorneys who are admitted
18 in Nevada but do not maintain an office here. Docket No. 10. Mr. Boone has filed a response.
19 Docket No. 11. That response represents that Mr. Boone is physically in Nevada roughly one
20 week per month to provide legal services. *Id.* at ¶ 5. Mr. Boone also asserts essentially that he
21 has a set-up that amounts to a virtual office here, with a receptionist and workspace that is shared
22 with unrelated professionals. *Id.* at ¶¶ 4, 7.

23 It is not entirely clear to the Court that Mr. Boone “maintains an office in Nevada” for
24 purposes of Local Rule IA 11-1(b).¹ At the same time, Mr. Boone is implicitly attesting that he is
25

26 ¹ Indeed, it appears to the Court that Mr. Boone has described the equivalent of a mail-drop
27 location at which he occasionally uses shared office space as the need arises. The local rules
28 expressly direct that a “mail-drop location does not constitute an office under this rule.” Local
Rule IA 11-1(b)(1). Mr. Boone has presented no legal authority that participation in a shared
workspace that may be occupied at any given time by completely unrelated professionals qualifies
as “maintaining an office.” The changing occupancy of this physical space appears to doom Mr.

1 able to fully comply with his litigation obligations. *See, e.g.*, Docket No. 11 at ¶ 5 (“As necessary,
2 I am also physically present in Las Vegas for litigation work”). The purpose behind the
3 requirement to have counsel physically present in Nevada is clear: such presence is necessary,
4 *inter alia*, to enable efficient service on counsel, to ensure personal attendance at court hearings,
5 and to foster scheduling of depositions. Given the circumstances, the Court will defer ruling
6 conclusively on whether Mr. Booke is subject to the requirements in Local Rule IA 11-1(b). The
7 Court may revisit this issue at any time, and will be especially inclined to do so in the event that it
8 becomes clear that Mr. Booke’s non-presence in the state is a hindrance to the efficient
9 advancement of this litigation.²

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: June 28, 2018

12 
13 _____
14 Nancy J. Koppe
15 United States Magistrate Judge
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 _____
27 Booke’s position. *See* Black’s Law Dictionary (7th ed.) (defining “maintenance” as “[t]o continue
28 in possession of (property, etc.)”).

² Of course, nothing herein prevents Mr. Booke from complying with Local Rule IA 11-
1(b) without further Court order so as to put this issue to rest.